

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15-18 and 20 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 2-4, 7, 8, 11-14 and 19 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 15, 17 and 20 are amended.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 4-6 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate claims 2 and 4 and claims 5 and 6 have been placed in independent form. Thus, claims 1, 5 and 6 are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action objects to claim 20. Claim 20 is amended to correct the informalities pointed out by the Examiner.

The Office Action rejects claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 10 is amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7 and 11-15 under the doctrine of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-6 and 10 of U.S. Application No. 10/567,034, now U.S. Patent No. 7,225,902. A Terminal Disclaimer is attached to obviate this rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 9-11, 13-15, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over JP-64-069489 to Masumoto; claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Masumoto in view of JP-10139327 to Kamioka; claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Masumoto in view of EP 1 319 627 to Mitsui; and claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Masumoto (incorrectly identified as Mizuno) in view of Kamioka and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,270,441 to Hymans.

With respect to claims 1-8 and 11-14 these rejections are moot. With respect to the remaining claims, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 recites, in combination with other claim features, an elevator apparatus comprising a wall portion provided with a recess and a car guide shoe at least partially disposed in the recess. Such a feature encompasses Applicant's exemplary embodiment as illustrated in Fig. 2 wherein recesses 7a, 7b are formed in cage 6. Car guide shoes 20a, 20b are at least partially disposed in the recess 7a, 7b.

In Masumoto, guide shoes 27 and 29 are located below or above the car 21. See Figs. 1 and 3. Thus, Masumoto does not disclose the car guide shoes at least partially disposed in a recess as in Applicant's independent claim 9. Therefore, claim 9 distinguishes over Masumoto.

With respect to independent claim 15, Masumoto does not disclose a car provided with a suspending portion to which a main suspending member for suspending the car is connected and the suspending portion is disposed in the recess common to the car guide shoe on the vertical projection plane. Such a feature encompasses Applicant's exemplary embodiment as illustrated in Fig. 14. First and second rope connecting portions 8a and 8b are provided in the first and second recesses 21a, 22b, respectively on a vertical projection plane. Masumoto discloses hoisting rope 33 connected to both ends of a lower beam 24. In Fig. 3 of Masumoto, the connection appears to be offset from portion 23a. Thus, claim 15 is distinguishable over Masumoto.

With respect to independent claim 18, Masumoto does not disclose a first car guide rail and a second car guide rail having a pitch between car guide rail rear faces which is set equal to or smaller than a car suspension pitch defined by the first main suspending member and the second main suspending member, in a width direction of the car. Such a feature encompasses Applicant's exemplary embodiment as illustrated in Fig. 1. Pitch G1 denotes an inter-car car guide rail rear face pitch or a dimension between the rear faces of the car guide rails 2a and 2b in the width direction of the car 4. G1 is set equal to or smaller than inter-car suspension pitch F0, a dimension between the first end portion 14a and the third end portion 15a attached to rope connecting portions 8a and 8b respectively in the width direction of the car 4.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertion on page 8 that the pitch of the rope portion running behind the guide rail in Fig. 1 of Masumoto corresponds to Applicant's claim 18. The portion of the rope 33 running behind the guide rail 31 does not correspond to a car suspension pitch defined by the first main suspending member and the second main suspending member as recited in claim 18. As shown in Fig. 1 of Masumoto, rope 33 is attached to the car 21 close to guide shoes 29. Thus, claim 18 is distinguishable over Masumoto.

With respect to claim 20, neither Masumoto nor Hymans disclose a safety device at least partially disposed in the recess. Such a feature encompasses Applicant's exemplary embodiment as illustrated in Fig. 5 wherein safety device 22 has an engaging portion accommodated in recesses 7a and 7b. The Office Action recognizes that Masumoto does not disclose this feature. Hymans discloses a

safety device 17 provided outside the frame work 18. Therefore, claim 20 is distinguishable over Masumoto, Kamioka and Hymans.

The remaining dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above as well as for the individual features they recite.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 13, 2007

By:



Michael Britton  
Registration No. 47,260

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620